

SRC APPROVED

Date October 11, 2012  
SLM

## State Records Committee Meeting

Division of Archives, Courtyard Meeting Room

August 9, 2012

Salt Lake City, Utah

Members Present: Lex Hemphill, Media Representative  
Doug Misner, History Representative  
Scott Daniels, Citizen Representative  
Ernest Rowley, Elected Public Official  
Patricia Smith-Mansfield, Governor's Designee  
Scott Whittaker, Private Records Manager

Legal Counsel: Paul Tonks, Attorney General's Office  
Ed Lombard, Attorney General's Office

Executive Secretary: Susan Mumford, Utah State Archives  
Attending via telephone: Ross George, petitioner

Others Attending: Matt Anderson, Attorney for UDC, respondent  
Rosemary Cundiff, Archives staff  
Glen Fairclough, Archives staff  
Paul Haik, Attorney for petitioner  
Brent Jacobson, UDC, respondent  
Sonya Kintaro, Salt Lake City, respondent  
Cindi Mansell, Salt Lake City, respondent  
Lorianne Ouderkirk, Archives staff  
Gina Proctor, UDC, respondent  
Rusty Vetter, Salt Lake City, respondent

### Hearing – Ross George vs. Utah Department of Corrections

Mr. Lex Hemphill called the meeting to order. At 9:51 a.m., a connection to the prison was established by telephone. Ross George was contacted to take part in the hearing. Mr. Lex Hemphill introduced himself. Matt Anderson, Assistant Attorney General, representing the Department of Corrections introduced himself. Captain Brent Jacobson accompanied Mr. Anderson. Mr. Hemphill explained the procedures for the hearing.

### Opening statement – petitioner

Mr. George said he had requested officers first and last names. He requested the names of officers that were on duty for certain days at the Gunnison prison. He experienced retaliation there and brought it to the attention of several staff members: a lieutenant, a sergeant, and a captain. He received a response that no records existed to fulfill his request. The officers at the prison did not wear name tags so the inmates could not identify them. He said he was indigent and could not make or pay for copies. He had written a letter to the governor about another issue and the letter had been returned to him. He said marking the letters as legal mail had

made a difference and he got answers from the office of the governor when he did that. He had asked for prison policies and had not been given what he had requested. ACR 28 was a policy that explained the implication of legal rights in requesting records. He said he had an active grievance. He wanted to know if he could receive the officer's names without GRAMA requests in the future. AEO2 Code of Conduct policies explained dereliction of duty as a failure to act when alerted to the existence of a problem. He had requested officers' names in the past and had not been denied.

#### **Opening statement – respondent**

Mr. Anderson said issues such as requests for policy and procedure manuals and medical records had been made by Mr. George as he tried to include other requests along with the current hearing. The other issues were not ripe for a hearing because all levels of request and appeal procedures had not been followed. The only issue before the Committee was the April 11, 2012, GRAMA request for a list of officers who were working on certain units on certain dates. The prison responded that it did not have a record responsive to the request. Partially responsive records such as schedules for posted positions were available. The schedule would only show sergeants and officers assigned to certain posts. In order to provide a list the Department of Corrections would have to cull the information from various sources and question the employees who had worked those days. Time cards and security data would have to be examined and a record would have to be created. GRAMA is clear that a government agency is not required to compile, format, manipulate, package, summarize, or tailor information to fulfill a request. The time and manpower was not available to produce such a record. The prison would be willing to provide Mr. George with a list of the officers and sergeants on the specific units on specific days as long as he understood that the records would not include all of the ranks he asked for. There could be inaccuracies in the information. Assignments varied and some officers could have been called away to train or given other assignments. Mr. Anderson requested that the Committee uphold the determination of Corrections on the matter. Mr. Hemphill swore in Brent Jacobsen as a witness. Captain Jacobsen described the time sheets submitted by officers in the prison system to account for their hours. The time sheets did not detail the assignments and locations.

#### **Testimony – petitioner**

Mr. George said the names and time sheets would not provide him with the information about the chain of command. His complaints about the retaliation he experienced extended to the superior officers. He said officers were required to log in as they entered a building because of security concerns. There should be a record of the facility and what officers were present on the days requested. Because the officers did not wear name badges, the inmates were not able to identify them. He asked that some measures be taken so that inmates could identify the staff they talk to. Name tags would alleviate the need to make a GRAMA request for officers' names. Mr. Hemphill said that concern was not before the Committee. The Committee was hearing the appeal because requested records were denied at the department level.

#### **Testimony – respondent**

Mr. Anderson asked Brent Jacobsen about his position at the prison. He replied that he was a captain and in charge of scheduling and security at the Draper facility. He said he had worked in scheduling for over two years. He was not aware of any records that were fully responsive

to Mr. George's request. There were partial records of the assignments of officers and there were time sheets. Officers could be shifted around within their assigned locations and no record would tell the exact location of any particular officer at a particular time within the unit. There could be a roster for the days that would list the officers on duty for the four days for which records had been requested. Mr. Anderson said that assignment rosters for officers and sergeants could be provided to Mr. George.

#### **Closing – petitioner**

Mr. George thanked the Committee and the representatives of Corrections for hearing his appeal. He expressed concern that policy manuals that had direct implications on his rights were being withheld. Cross references in the manuals that referred to other statutes and other policies would help shed light on particular grievances. Having an active case in court would mean that his rights were directly implicated. That should give an inmate the right to view policies that would otherwise be withheld. In 2008, at the Gunnison facility, he was verbally threatened when he filed a grievance. He was told that serious problems would follow him if he pursued the grievance. He wanted it on the record that he had experienced retaliations from staff members for filing grievances.

#### **Closing – respondent**

Mr. Anderson said that Mr. George was bringing up GRAMA requests for manuals and policies. Those requests were not part of the current hearing. There were other venues for Mr. George to address issues of retaliation. The Records Committee was not the place to address those issues. Some of the information requested was available and Corrections had offered to provide it. The creation or compilation of a record was not required by GRAMA. Mr. Anderson asked that the State Records Committee uphold the determination of UDC in the matter.

#### **Deliberation**

Mr. Daniels said that some of Mr. George's concerns were outside the scope of the Committee. For the records request, Mr. Daniels said he had observed that some governmental entities really want to produce records and comply with requests. Others require a petitioner to know the exact name of a record before producing it. Although the documents Corrections is willing to produce may have some inaccuracies, they seemed clearly within the request limits. Mr. George should not have had to appeal to the State Records Committee to get them. Mr. Rowley said UCA 63G-2-203(2) outlined the compilation of records and the possibility of charging for such compilation. The section may not be applicable to the current case, but the assertion that an entity is not required to compile a record is not totally accurate. A requestor could be told there would be a fee for the compilation and could agree to pay the fee. Ms. Smith-Mansfield said that originally Corrections had claimed not to have records responsive to the request. She made a motion that the responsive records, the daily assignment roster and the assignment summary, be provided to the requestor. Mr. Whittaker seconded the motion. Mr. Tonks said the number of hours worked per pay period was a public record pursuant to UCA 63G-2-301(2)(b). Ms. Smith-Mansfield agreed that the records were public but added that the responsive records could be redacted. Any parts of the record that were deemed to be protected under UCA 63G-2-305(12) could be redacted. The work assignments of officers and sergeants would be included and not other personnel. Mr. Whittaker affirmed his second of the

amended motion. A vote was taken. Mr. Daniels, Mr. Hemphill, Mr. Misner, Mr. Rowley, Ms. Smith-Mansfield, and Mr. Whittaker voted in favor of the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. The motion passed. Mr. Hemphill said an order would be sent within seven days.

### **Hearing Mark Haik vs. Salt Lake City Corporation**

The parties introduced themselves. Mr. Paul Haik represented Mark Haik, the petitioner. Russell Vetter introduced himself as the attorney representing the city. Doug Misner, a member of the State Records Committee, said he was acquainted with Mark Haik from his work in the History Research Center. He had worked with Mark Haik doing research in the Research Center but did not think it would interfere with his ability to be impartial in the hearing. Mr. Hemphill said the large volume of documents received from both parties was an indication of the need to clarify the issues being considered at the hearing.

### **Opening – Petitioner**

Mr. Paul Haik illustrated the time line and the amount of records received in response to Mark Haik's records requests to the city. One issue under consideration was that invoices produced by the city had been redacted. A dispute sprang from the fact that the city's records committee said there was no basis for withholding the records. They had ordered the records produced with the stipulation that any redactions be listed and justified. Another hearing before the city's records committee was scheduled for August 24 on that matter. The invoices and the redactions would not be considered at the current hearing. Mr. Haik said that the current hearing was only to consider sanctions against the city. Reviewing the invoices, he said, it was apparent there were invoices that were missing. There were some attorney employment agreements between Salt Lake City and Mr. Clyde. A detailed request was submitted to Salt Lake City for the records that had not been produced. More invoices were received. Mr. Haik distributed an exhibit illustrating the discrepancy between various requests and the records produced by the city. Karen Greenleaf's employment record was outlined. She had responded to initial requests made by Mr. Haik. Mr. Haik elaborated on multiple discrepancies in the records produced by the city. The records had to do with the status of the water agreements that existed to serve Albion Basin subdivision. Mr. Haik said the city had required \$250 as a pre-payment for research before the records could be produced. Mr. Haik believed the failure to produce pertinent records was deliberate and was intended to conceal a conflict of interest in the work of Mr. Clyde.

### **Opening – respondent**

Mr. Vetter said an issue to be addressed was whether the Committee had jurisdiction to sanction a party when no order had been produced from the Committee. Historically, there was not a precedent for the Committee to issue sanctions. The city contended that the Committee did not have jurisdiction to sanction the City. If such jurisdiction existed, it would extend to the petitioner as well as to the city. The conduct of the petitioner justified sanctions. The city believed that it behaved reasonably. It was not reasonable for Mr. Haik to set up a situation where an error was made and it was used to accuse someone of intentional concealment over eighteen years prior to the current time.

**Testimony – petitioner**

Mr. Haik produced supplemental material and distributed it to the Committee members. Mr. Haik explained the new documents. Ms. Smith-Mansfield said the Committee needed documentation before a meeting in order to respond to the issues adequately. Mr. Haik apologized for the late delivery of the documentation. He explained the significance of each of the additional exhibits. He commented on each of the thirty-four exhibits discussing water supply and service to the Albion Basin subdivision. Ms. Greenleaf's working relationship with Mr. Clyde was apparent, he said, in the exhibits as she communicated the result of water negotiations with landowners and the city. He said these exhibits illustrated the number of invoices that were withheld by the city. Multiple requests were required to illicit the response from the city that eventually resulted in many pages of records relating to the original request. There seemed to be a conscious, deliberate effort by the city not to produce records. The missing invoices pertained to the period in which Ms. Greenleaf was coordinating with the Town of Alta in providing false information. Mr. Haik said his constitutional right to information was denied and for 63 days records were withheld. That was the period of time to consider for sanctions. He asked for a sanction against the city for withholding records.

**Testimony – respondent**

Mr. Vetter read an affidavit from Ms. Greenleaf outlining her role in the appeal for records. She said in the affidavit that she was employed in the Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities. Presently she served as the department's water, canyon water rights, and property coordinator. She had been employed by Salt Lake City for twenty-five years and the department for twenty-three years and had held various positions. Her present duties included assisting in responses to GRAMA requests and records retention. She was also a volunteer member of the Salt Lake City's Records Appeals Board. However, she did not participate in the board's deliberations that involved the Department of Public Utilities. On behalf of the department she said, she had received numerous GRAMA requests from Mr. Haik over the past years. In several instances the requests were not clear and the department could not determine what records Mr. Haik was seeking. She said she contacted Mr. Haik via email or phone to request clarification. In some instances, he would respond with further directions. If Mr. Haik had questions about the responses of the department, he knew how to make contact, she said. On or about January 27, 2012, the City Recorder's Office received a GRAMA request from Mr. Haik. The request was entered into the city's electronic GRAMA program. Relevant records were searched. The department's retention schedule may not have retained financial records about matters that were in dispute 17 or 18 years ago, she said. She had no reason to intentionally withhold such records. She said she respected the importance of access to public information and would not intentionally withhold records that were responsive to a GRAMA request without identifying the records and disclosing the basis in writing for withholding a record. Approximately 2,000 pages of documents were released to Mr. Haik in March, 2012. She said she believed that all responsive records had been produced to Mr. Haik. She had not received any questions from Mr. Haik about the adequacy of the response. The rest of the affidavit is attached as part of this record. Mr. Vetter continued, saying that Salt Lake City regularly receives GRAMA requests from Mr. Haik. He was and is familiar with the GRAMA process and knows that a broad request will elicit a broad response, and a charge will be made for voluminous amounts of records. The accusations made against Ms. Greenleaf for withholding records have no merit. The Committee has no jurisdiction to impose sanctions

on a matter if it has not issued an order. Responsive documents were eventually delivered to Mr. Haik and no detriment has been shown as a result of the delay.

### **Closing – petitioner**

Salt Lake City's interpretation that a petitioner should ask for specific records rather than make a broad request was the opposite of how Mr. Haik saw the request process. Because of the broad request, all the records relevant to the request should have been produced. The existence of other records became clear as a result of the broad request and a more detailed request resulted. Then, the petitioner was required to pay for research to locate the relevant records that should have been included in the response to the first request. The invoices produced showed that Salt Lake City had a long term relationship with Mr. Clyde as outside counsel pertaining to water matters. Mr. Haik commented on the issue raised by Mr. Hemphill. Mr. Hemphill said that UCA 63G-2-403(14) indicated that the Committee could impose sanctions only on orders issued by the State Records Committee. Mr. Haik said that the city review board had issued a final order and under the city's order, it was subject to sanction as a necessary incident of the Committee's authority.

### **Closing – respondent**

Mr. Vetter addressed the jurisdictional issue. Upon review of the January, 2012 disclosure of records, Mr. Haik had said that he observed the billing records of Mr. Clyde prior to 1995 were not disclosed. A petitioner's failure to appeal should not make it possible for them to then ask for sanctions. Sanctions could be imposed only on a failure to comply with the Committee's own orders. The best evidence of the good faith response of the city was in the affidavit of Ms. Greenleaf. It appeared that Mr. Haik had developed a conspiracy theory to harass Ms. Greenleaf. To suggest that seventeen years ago she knew something and had a plot to damage the Haik family was not fair. Ms. Greenleaf is a long-standing, excellent employee of the city. To have her reputation maligned by the petitioner was not appropriate. Sanctions were appropriate against Mr. Haik, but not against the city.

### **Deliberation**

Ms. Smith-Mansfield made a motion that the Committee dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. GRAMA provides penalties for intentional non-disclosure, and a remedy is found in UCA 63G-2-801(3). Pursuant to 63G-2-402 and 63G-2-403(14)(d)(i)(a), it is not within the jurisdiction of the State Records Committee to impose sanctions when it does concern an order from the Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Daniels. A vote was taken. Mr. Hemphill, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Misner, Mr. Rowley, Ms. Smith-Mansfield, and Mr. Whittaker voted in favor of the motion. The vote was unanimous, six to zero. Mr. Hemphill thanked the parties for their attendance and said an order would be sent within seven days.

### **Other Business**

Mr. Daniels said that he had enjoyed working with the Committee. He said the Committee made very good and very important decisions. He said he had been in the legislature for four years where everyone had a hidden agenda. No one on the Committee had a hidden agenda and all members were trying to do the right thing and follow the statute. He said he was currently serving on eight or nine boards and had to cut back. Mr. Hemphill complimented the two members of the Committee who were ending their terms: Scott Whittaker and Scott

Daniels. He called them the two great Scotts. He presented cards and State History memberships along with subscriptions to the Utah Historical Quarterly to each of them. He thanked them for their service. Ms. Smith-Mansfield said that the legislative interim session would take place next week and new members of the Committee could be approved then.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Hemphill suggested a correction in the dates of the Ombudsman's service mentioned on page seven of the minutes. Mr. Rowley made a motion to approve the minutes of July, 2012. Mr. Whittaker seconded the motion. A vote was taken. Mr. Hemphill, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Misner, Mr. Rowley, Ms. Smith-Mansfield, and Mr. Whittaker voted in favor of the motion. The vote was unanimous, six to zero. The minutes were approved.

### **Retention Schedules**

Mr. Glen Fairclough presented two retention schedules for approval by the Committee.

1. Series #27954, Inmate medical records, was a newly created series. A general schedule, 16-28 exists which retains medical records for 7 years. Iron County Jail has requested ten year retention. Case files have ten year retention and they would like medical files to correspond.
2. Series #26185, Underground storage tank certification files, was three years. The proposal is to extend the retention to five years.

Ms. Smith-Mansfield made a motion to approve the retention schedules. Mr. Rowley seconded the motion. A vote was taken. Mr. Hemphill, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Misner, Mr. Rowley, Ms. Smith-Mansfield, and Mr. Whittaker voted in favor of the motion. The vote was unanimous, six to zero. The retention schedules were approved.

### **Timeliness of requests**

Ms. Mumford said a particular hearing had not been scheduled because the timeliness of the appeal to the CAO and then to the State Records Committee. The period of time was longer than thirty days. A petitioner received a late response from an agency and now wanted to appeal to the SRC after a response finally came from the agency. Ms. Smith-Mansfield said the period of time during which an appeal could be made to the SRC is calculated from the date of the CAO's denial.

### **SRC Appeals received**

See attached report.

### **District Court updates**

See attached report.

**Adjournment 12:44 p.m.**

## **STATE RECORDS COMMITTEE**

**August 9, 2012**

**State Archives Building, Courtyard Meeting Room  
346 S. Rio Grande (450 West)  
Salt Lake City**

### **AGENDA**

**Call to Order 9:30 a.m.**

**Hearing: Ross George vs. Utah Department of Corrections.** Mr. George is appealing the denial of a record of staff members who worked in an area of the CUCF prison on certain dates.

**Hearing: Mark Haik vs. Salt Lake City Corporation.** Mr. Haik is appealing the partial denial of records pertaining to the engagement of attorneys for Salt Lake City Corporation and invoices for attorney services.

1. **Approval of July 12, 2012 SRC Minutes, action item**
2. **Retention Schedules for approval, action item**
3. **Committee vacancies and outgoing members, action item**
4. **Timeliness of requests, appeals to CAO, and appeals to SRC, action item**
5. **SRC appeals received**
6. **Cases in District Court**
7. **Other Business**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Next meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 13, 2012, at 9:30 a.m.



## **August 2012 Records Committee Case Updates**

### **District Court Cases**

**Danysh v. Unified Police Dept.**, 3<sup>rd</sup> District, Salt Lake County, Case No. 120904327, Judge Quinn, filed June 22, 2012.

**Current Disposition:** Complaint filed by Kurt Danysh, answer filed on behalf of the Committee on August 1, 2012. Petitioner has not served the Unified Police Department so they are not a party to the proceedings at this time.

**Utah Dept. of Human Services v. Wilson**, 3<sup>rd</sup> District, Salt Lake County, Case No. 120903186, Judge Medley, filed May 10, 2012.

**Current Disposition:** Complaint filed by Human Services, answers filed by the Committee and Wilson. Answer filed by Wilson raised issues outside of the appeal filed by Human Services. June 5, 2012, Human Services filed a "Motion to Strike, or in the Alternative, for More Definite Statement." Court has asked for a judgment entry from Department of Human Services granting the motion to strike. Order has been drafted and submitted to the court for approval.

**Attorney General Office. v. Schroeder**, 3<sup>rd</sup> District, Salt Lake County, Case No. 110917733, Judge Hansen, filed Sept. 21, 2011; Case No. 110917703, Judge Medley, filed Sept. 20, 2011.

**Current Disposition:** Oral argument is set for Sept. 6, 2012, 9:00 AM for cross motions for summary judgment filed by the Attorney General Office and Schroeder.

**Salt Lake City v. Jordan River Restoration Network**, 3<sup>rd</sup> Judicial District, Salt Lake County, Case No. 100910873, Judge Himonas. Filed June 18, 2010.

**Current Disposition:** Only pleading filed during the past six months was a notice of appearance of new counsel on behalf of Jordan River.

**SRC Appeals Received  
August 9, 2012**

1. **Gregory Williams vs. UDC.** Mr. Williams wanted the committee to investigate a grievance about improper disclosure of his private records. No jurisdiction. Wrote letter.
2. **Bobby Archuleta vs. UDC.** Appeal incomplete. Wrote letter.
3. **Karl Losee vs. UDC.** Mr. Losee is appealing the denial of the minutes of the warden's meeting of November 3, 2008. Appeal incomplete. Wrote letter.
4. **Karl Losee vs. UDC.** Housing assignments. Wrote letter of denial. Approved by Betsy and Doug
5. **Edward Owens vs. Davis County Courts.** No jurisdiction. Wrote letter.
6. **Ross George vs. UDC.** Hearing August 9, 2012
7. **Mark Haik vs. Salt Lake City.** Hearing August 9, 2012
8. **Bill Oram/Tribune vs. Granite School District.** Scheduled for September
9. **Common Cause vs. Uintah County.** Scheduled for September
10. **Eric Probasco/Sanpete Messenger vs. Department of Public Safety.** Scheduled for September
11. **Peterson vs. Woods Cross.** Scheduled for September
12. **Moses Shepherd vs. UDC.** Medical records and fee waiver
13. **Janelle Stecklein/Tribune vs. UTA.** Database of crimes and locations. Time frame issue waiting for Board of Trustees decision
14. **Michael Gubarev vs. Workforce Services.** Untimely appeals later response appealed to SRC.
15. **Michael Luesse vs. UDC.** Limit of 100 pages from UDC
16. **Steven Sanchez vs. Tax Commission.** Wants sales tax information on prison commissary.

# **Retention and Classification Report**

**Agency:** Iron County Jail (Utah) (160)

2136 North Main Street  
Cedar City, UT 84720  
(435)586-3356

**Records Officer** Ranon Hulet

27954 Inmate medical records

## Utah State Archives

**AGENCY:** Iron County Jail (Utah)

**SERIES:** 27954

2

**TITLE:** Inmate medical records

**DATES:** 2004-

**ARRANGEMENT:** numerical by inmate number

**ANNUAL ACCUMULATION:** 10.00 cubic feet.

**DESCRIPTION:**

These files are the complete medical records for all prisoners. They may include all prescriptions authorized, a log for all doctor or hospital visits, inmates medical complaints, and other medical information.

**RETENTION:**

Retain 10 years

**DISPOSITION:**

Destroy.

**STATE RECORDS COMMITTEE STATUS:**

This retention has not been approved by the State Records Committee.

**FORMAT MANAGEMENT:**

Records in electronic format are also covered by this schedule. If a separate retention for electronic formats is not provided, follow the length of retention for the paper copy.

Paper: Retain in Office for 10 years after release of inmate and then destroy provided no further bookings in county jail.

Photographs: Retain in Office for 10 years after release of inmate and then destroy provided no further bookings in county jail.

**APPRAISAL:**

Administrative Legal

The office keeps the medical records for the same length of time (10 years) as the corresponding inmate file (series 5489).

## Utah State Archives

**AGENCY:** Iron County Jail (Utah)

**SERIES:** 27954

**TITLE:** Inmate medical records

(continued)

**PRIMARY CLASSIFICATION:**

Private          Utah Code 63G-2-302(1)(b)

**PERSONAL DATA ELEMENT**

Medical/Dental Information

**GOVERNMENT RECORDS ACCESS MANAGEMENT**

Reasons for collection/use of personal data:

To record medical/diagnosis/disease control information.

To meet federal or state law requirements.

To support administration of justice and public safety.

# **Retention and Classification Report**

**Agency:** Department of Environmental Quality. Division of Environmental  
Response and Remediation (1835)  
195 North 1950 West  
P.O. Box 144840  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4840  
801-536-4100

**Records Officer** Shane Bekkemellom

26185 Underground storage tank certification files

## Utah State Archives

**AGENCY:** Department of Environmental Quality. Division of Environmental Response and Remediation

**SERIES:** 26185

1

**TITLE:** Underground storage tank certification files

**VARIANT** UST certification files

**DATES:** 1989-

**ARRANGEMENT:** Alphabetical by name of facility or last name of property owner

**ANNUAL ACCUMULATION:** 5.00 cubic feet.

**DESCRIPTION:**

This series contains documents compiled by the agency in the process of certifying individuals who do work administered through the underground storage tank program. The records in this series are used to ensure individuals are properly certified in accordance with state rules. Records include examinations, results, answer sheets, applications, and financial assurance documents. Additionally, the records provide evidence of experience, education and training, as well as compliance and enforcement.

**RETENTION:**

Retain 5 years

**DISPOSITION:**

Destroy.

**STATE RECORDS COMMITTEE STATUS:**

This retention has not been approved by the State Records Committee.

**FORMAT MANAGEMENT:**

Records in electronic format are also covered by this schedule. If a separate retention for electronic formats is not provided, follow the length of retention for the paper copy.

Paper: Retain in Office for 5 years after certification expires and then destroy.

Computer data files: Retain in Office until administrative need ends and then delete.

**APPRAISAL:**

Administrative Fiscal

## Utah State Archives

**AGENCY:** Department of Environmental Quality. Division of Environmental Response and Remediation

**SERIES:** 26185

**TITLE:** Underground storage tank certification files

(continued)

**PRIMARY CLASSIFICATION:**

Public

**SECONDARY CLASSIFICATION(S):**

Protected. UCA 63G-2-305(5) (2008)

Private. UCA 63G-2-302(1)(h) and (2)(d) (2008)